

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed December 7, 2009, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-10, 27-32, 34 and 41-54 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claim 27 has been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. As a result, claims 1-10, 27-32, 34 and 41-54 are pending for examination with claims 1, 27 and 54 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

I. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Nishio, U.S. Patent No. 7,316,022 B2 (hereinafter Nishio) in view of Howard, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,823,526 (hereinafter Howard). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a network interaction system and recites, *inter alia*:

receiving metadata for identifying the network device, the ***metadata comprising a hardware identifier*** for the network device;
determining ***configuration information*** using the hardware identifier for the network device, the configuration information indicating a configuration of the network device and comprising one or more registry keys.

The Office Action admits that Nishio does not meet this limitation, but asserts that “it would have been obvious... that the system of Nishio can be modified to retrieve the configuration information using the metadata instead of at the same time with the metadata.” Though, the Office Action fails to articulate any rationale supporting the conclusion of obviousness. M.P.E.P § 2141 states that “[R]ejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness” and “Office personnel must articulate findings of fact that support the rationale relied upon in an obviousness rejection.” As the Office Action fails to provide a rationale, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

As a further reason the rejection should be withdrawn, Nishio would not be modified to retrieve the configuration information using the metadata instead of at the same time with the metadata as purported by the Office Action. The Office Action asserts “metadata comprising a hardware identifier” is described by Nishio at column 7, lines 6-15 and lines 36-39. These passages of Nishio describe device configuration information that is sent from the printer to the PC. The Office Action further asserts “configuration information” as recited in claim 1 is described by Nishio at lines 16-29 of column 7. This passage simply details the contents of Nishio’s device configuration information (e.g., PrinterMakeandModel, PrinterName, PrinterPDL, PrinterLocation...). Thus, the Office Action relies upon Nishio’s device configuration information to disclose both the “metadata” and the “configuration information” recited in claim 1. Therefore the “configuration information” is necessarily received at the same time as the “metadata” because in Nishio, they are the same thing. Accordingly, once the “metadata” is received there would be no reason to additionally determine the “configuration information” because the “metadata” contains the “configuration information”.

Howard is cited to show setting registry keys and does not cure the deficiencies of Nishio. Even if the references were combined, the combination would not meet all limitations of the claim.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art of record, such that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1, incorporate all of its limitations, and should be allowed for at least the same reasons. Though Applicants do not necessarily concur with the rejections, Applicants believe it is unnecessary to separately address the rejections of the dependent claims. However, the dependent claims also add limitations that further distinguish over the references, and Applicants reserve the right to argue further for the patentability of these claims.

II. Claims 27-32, 34, and 41-49 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Nishio, in view of Meenan et al.

Independent Claim 27

Claim 27, as amended, is directed to a method of configuring a network device on a network for use with at least one other network device installed on the network. Claim 27 recites, *inter alia*:

detecting that the network device is no longer on the network; and
using the stored information for re-authenticating the network device to automatically re-associate the network device with the at least one other network device when the network device is reconnected to the network.

This amendment is supported in the specification, for example, on page 14, lines 2-13. The Office Action admits that Nishio does not disclose authenticating a network device. Nishio certainly does not show “using the stored information for re-authenticating the network device to automatically re-associate the network device with the at least one other network device” as recited in amended claim 27.

Meenan discusses the configuration of a wireless access point but also fails to disclose the above highlighted limitations. Even if the references were combined, the combination would not meet all limitations of the claim.

Accordingly, claim 27 patentably distinguishes over the prior art of record, such that the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Claims 28-32, 34, 41-49 and 52 depend from claim 27, incorporate all of its limitations, and should be allowed for at least the same reasons. Though Applicants do not necessarily concur with the rejections, Applicants believe it is unnecessary to separately address the rejections of the dependent claims. However, the dependent claims also add limitations that further distinguish over the references, and Applicants reserve the right to argue further for the patentability of these claims.

III. Claims 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Nishio, in view of Howard, further in view of Meenan et al. U.S. Patent No.7,283,505 B1, (hereinafter Meenan).

Independent Claim 54

Claim 54 is directed to a computer-readable storage medium comprising computer-executable instructions that, when executed, perform a method of configuring a network device on a network for use with a computer on the network. Claim 54 recites, *inter alia*:

receiving metadata for identifying the network device, the
metadata comprising an identifier for the network device;

...

determining configuration information for the network
device using the identifier, the configuration information
comprising driver files and one or more registry keys.

This claim distinguishes over the cited references. The Office Action contends that the Nishio, Howard, Meenan combination satisfy claim 54 using the same rationale as the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 53. It should be clear from the discussion of Nishio and Howard in connection with claim 1 that these references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “determining configuration information for the network device using the identifier” as recited in claim 54.

Meenan is cited to show authenticating a network device and does not cure the deficiencies of the Nishio and Howard combination. Even if the references were combined, the combination would not meet all limitations of the claim.

Accordingly, claim 54 patentably distinguishes over the prior art of record, such that the rejection of claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

General Comments on Dependent Claims

Since each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the allowability of each of the dependent claims individually. Applicants do not, however, necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor do Applicants concur that the basis for the rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to specifically address the patentability of the dependent claims in the future, if deemed necessary.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of this application.

If the response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge Deposit Account No. 23/2825 under Docket No. 23/2825 under Docket No. M1103.70668US00 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edmund J. Walsh

Registration No.: 32,950

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

617.646.8000